



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/930,359	08/15/2001	Ulises J. Cicciarelli	RSW920010067US1	3454
7590	09/30/2004		EXAMINER	
Gerald R. Woods IBM Corporation T81/503 PO Box 12195 Research Triangle Park, NC 27709			MITCHELL, JASON D	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2124	

DATE MAILED: 09/30/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/930,359	CICCIARELLI ET AL. <i>SL</i>
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Jason Mitchell	2124

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 August 2001.  
 2a) This action is **FINAL**.                            2b) This action is non-final.  
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-19 is/are pending in the application.  
 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.  
 6) Claim(s) 1-19 is/are rejected.  
 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.  
 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  
 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
 a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:  
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date 8/15/01.

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.  
 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)  
 6) Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

**DETAILED ACTION**

This action is in response to an application filed on 08/15/01.

Claims 1-19 are pending in this case.

***Double Patenting***

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

1. Claims 1-7, 10-12, and 15-17 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-7, 9-11, and 13-15 of copending application No. 09/930,325 to Cicciarelli et al. (09/930,325). Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the claims of Application No. 09/930,325 are further limitations of the claims of the instant application as shown below.

2. This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

3. **Regarding Claim 1:** 09/930,325 (claim 1) discloses a method of improving installation ... comprising steps of: defining an object model ... and one or more topology objects ... and populating the object model and one or more topologies.

4. **Regarding Claim 2:** The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated; further, 09/930,325 (claim 2) discloses the step of instantiating a plurality of objects ... wherein the populating step populates the instantiated objects.

5. **Regarding Claim 3:** The rejection of claim 2 is incorporated; further, 09/930,325 (claim 3) discloses the instantiated objects are JavaBeans.

6. **Regarding Claim 4:** The rejection of claim 2 is incorporated; further, 09/930,325 (claim 4) discloses the instantiating step instantiates an object for the particular software installation package ...

7. **Regarding Claim 5:** The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated; further, 09/930,325 (claim 5) discloses the steps of: selecting at least one of the topologies ... and using the populated object model to install.

8. **Regarding Claim 6:** The rejection of claim 5 is incorporated; further, 09/930,325 (claim 6) discloses identifying one or more target machines ... downloading the ... software package ... and performing an installation.

9. **Regarding Claim 7:** The rejection of claim 6 is incorporated; further, 09/930,325 (claim 7) discloses authenticating a server ... prior to ... installation.

10. **Regarding Claim 10:** 09/930,325 (claim 9) discloses a system for improving installation ... comprising: means for defining an object model ... and

one or more topology objects ... and means for populating the object model ... and one or more topologies for deployment.

11. **Regarding Claim 11:** The rejection of claim 10 is incorporated; further, 09/930,325 (claim 10) discloses means for selecting a least one of the topologies ... and means for using the populated object model to install ... using the selected topology.

12. **Regarding Claim 12:** The rejection of claim 11 is incorporated; further, 09/930,325 (claim 11) discloses means for identifying one or more target machines ... downloading the ... installation package ... performing an installation.

13. **Regarding Claim 15:** 09/930,325 (claim 13) discloses a computer program product for improving installation ... comprising: ... defining an object model ... one or more topology objects ... populating the object model ... and one or more topologies for deployment.

14. **Regarding Claim 16:** The rejection of claim 15 is incorporated; further 09/930,325 (claim 14) discloses selecting at least one of the topologies ... and ... using the populated object model to install ... using the selected topology

15. **Regarding Claim 17:** The rejection of claim 16 is incorporated; further 09/930,325 (claim 15) discloses identifying one or more target machines ... downloading the particular software ... performing an installation at each of the identified machines.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

16. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

**17. Claims 1-2, 4-6, and 10-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by USPN 6,051,032 to Harrison et al (Harrison).**

18. **Regarding Claim 1, 10 and 15:** Harrison discloses a method, system and computer program product for improving installation of software packages (col. 2, line 28), comprising steps of: defining an object model (col. 2, lines 32-37 'bundle of install objects') representing a plurality of components of a software installation package (col. 2, lines 32-37 'install objects') and one or more topology objects (col. 2, lines 39-43 'bundle of model objects') wherein each component comprises a plurality of objects (col. 2, lines 32-37 'comprising necessary objects') and wherein each topology object identifies one or more selected ones of the components (col. 3, lines 52-54 'configuration details thereof'); and populating the object model to describe a particular software installation package (col. 2, lines 32-37 'loading a default bundle of install objects') and one or more

topologies for deployment of that particular software installation package (col. 2, lines 39-43 'a default bundle of model objects ... is displayed').

19. **Regarding Claim 2:** The rejections of claims 1, 10 and 15 are incorporated respectively; further, Harrison discloses instantiating a plurality of objects according to the defined object model, and wherein the populating step populates the instantiated objects (col. 2, lines 32-37 'loading a default bundle of install objects'). Further instantiating the objects is necessary for them to have any functionality, and hence is taught inherently.

20. **Regarding Claim 4:** the rejection of claim 2 is incorporated; further, Harrison inherently discloses the instantiating step instantiates an object (col. 2, lines 32-37 'loading a default bundle') for the particular software installation package and one or more component objects for each software component included in the particular software installation package (col. 2, lines 32-37 'loading a default bundle of install objects'). It would have been necessary to load the objects with data relating to the particular software installation package in order to install the particular software installation package.

21. **Regarding Claim 5, 11 and 16:** The rejections of claims 1, 10 and 15 are incorporated respectively; further Harrison discloses selecting at least one of the topologies for deployment (col. 4, lines 32-44 'the administrator is then able to choose either option 1 or option 2'); and using the populated object model to install the particular software installation package using the selected topology (col. 4, lines 32-44 'the image objects are then automatically created').

22. **Regarding Claim 6, 12 and 17:** the rejections of claims 5, 11 and 16 are incorporated respectively; further, Harrison discloses identifying one or more target machines on which the particular software installation package is to be installed (col. 3, lines 56-58 'installed onto a node'); downloading the particular software installation package to the identified targeted machines; And performing an installation at each of the identified target machines using the downloaded particular software installation package (col. 4, lines 16-18 'completing the installation'). A node (col. 3, line 57) generally refers to a remote computer in a network; therefore inherently discloses a means for downloading the image objects (col. 4 line 14) to the node to complete the installation (col. 4, line 16).

23. **Claims 1-6, and 8-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by USPN 6,601,236 B1 to Curtis (Curtis)**

The applied reference has a common assignee with the instant application. Based upon the earlier effective U.S. filing date of the reference, it constitutes prior art under 35 U.S.C. 102(e). This rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) might be overcome either by a showing under 37 CFR 1.132 that any invention disclosed but not claimed in the reference was derived from the inventor of this application and is thus not the invention "by another," or by an appropriate showing under 37 CFR 1.131.

24. **Regarding Claims 1, 10 and 15:** Curtis discloses a method, system and computer product, for improving installation of software packages (col. 3, lines 61-62 'for installing a program'), comprising steps of: defining an object model

representing a plurality of components of a software installation package (col. 10, lines 62-65 'file set objects') and one or more topology objects (col. 11, lines 9-12 'destination panel') wherein each component comprises a plurality of objects (col. 10, lines 62-65 'multiple install objects') and wherein each topology object identifies one or more selected ones of the components (col. 12, lines 3-8 'one or more portions of the program'); and populating the object model to describe a particular software installation package (col. 11, lines 12-15 'program object is built up') and one or more topologies for deployment of that particular software installation package (col. 11, lines 9-12 'destination panel').

25. **Regarding Claim 2:** The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated; further, Curtis discloses the step of instantiating a plurality of objects according to the defined object model, and wherein the populating step populates the instantiated objects (col. 11, lines 12-15 'program object is built up'). Instantiating an object model is a necessary step for the object model to have any functionality and therefore is taught inherently.

26. **Regarding Claim 3:** The rejection of claim 2 is incorporated; further, Curtis discloses the instantiated objects are JavaBeans. (col. 5, lines 26-27 'Java implementations described Herein')

27. **Regarding Claim 4:** The rejection of claim 2 is incorporated; further, Curtis discloses the instantiating step instantiates an object for the particular software installation package and one or more component objects for each software component included in the particular software installation package (col. 11, lines 12-15 'program object is built up'). Instantiating an object model is a

necessary step for the object model to have any functionality and therefore is taught inherently, further the object model would necessarily be populated with data relating to the particular software installation.

28. **Regarding Claim 5, 11 and 16:** The rejections of claims 1, 10 and 15 are incorporated respectively; further Curtis discloses selecting at least one of the topologies for deployment (col. 12, lines 1-24 'for each portion of the program'); and using the populated object model to install the particular software installation package using the selected topology (col. 13, line 3 'the file sets are installed').

29. **Regarding Claim 6, 12 and 17:** the rejections of claims 5, 11 and 16 are incorporated respectively; further, Curtis discloses identifying one or more target machines on which the particular software installation package is to be installed (col. 12, lines 1-24 'input the desired destination drive'); downloading the particular software installation package to the identified targeted machines (col. 13, lines 1-4 'file sets are installed on the assigned destination drives'); And performing an installation at each of the identified target machines using the downloaded particular software installation package (col. 13, lines 1-4 'file sets are installed on the assigned destination drives'). It was a common practice, well known in the art at the time of invention, to map drives to remote computers, therefore a 'destination drive' as disclosed in Curtis encompasses a 'target machine' as claimed. Further although Curtis does not explicitly disclose downloading software to the targeted machine, this is implicit in the installation step, which is disclosed (col. 13, lines 1-4).

30. **Regarding Claim 9, 14 and 19:** The rejections of claims 1, 10, and 15 are incorporated respectively; further, Curtis discloses that each topology object provides a required configuration of the software installation package (col. 12, lines 19-24 'assign the ... default drive').

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

31. **Claims 8-9, 13-14, and 18-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over USPN 6,051,032 to Harrison et al (Harrison).**

32. **Regarding Claim 8, 13 and 18:** The rejections of claims 1, 10, 15 are incorporated respectively; further, Harrison discloses a topology object that provides a method to recommend a configuration for a particular component of the software installation package (col. 3, lines 46-55 'configuration details thereof may be altered'), but does not explicitly disclose that each topology object provides a recommended configuration. Instead Harrison leaves the decision to the programmer (col. 3, lines 46-55 'The programmer ... sets them before shipping')

33. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to employ the individual recommended topologies disclosed in Harrison (col. 3, lines 46-55 'configuration details thereof may be altered') to make each topology in the bundle recommended.

34. The modification would have been obvious because one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to provide maximum flexibility for an

Art Unit: 2124

installation (col. 1, lines 25-32 'give the administrator a great deal of flexibility'), by providing recommended configurations for each component but not requiring any of them.

35. **Regarding Claim 9, 14 and 19:** The rejections of claims 1, 10, 15 are incorporated respectively; further Harrison discloses a topology object that provides a method to require a configuration for a specific component of the software installation package (col. 3, lines 46-55 'object C is not a model object and thus cannot be so altered'), but does not explicitly disclose that each topology object provides a required configuration. Instead Harrison leaves the decision to the programmer (col. 3, lines 46-55 'The programmer ... sets them before shipping')

36. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to employ the individual required topologies disclosed in Harrison (col. 3, lines 46-55 'object C is not a model object and thus cannot be so altered') to make each topology in the bundle required.

37. The modification would have been obvious because one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to provide the programmer with maximum control of an installation (col. 2, lines 60-67 'shifts the burden of understanding ... from the administrator to the application programmer'), by providing required configurations for each component.

38. **Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over USPN 6,051,032 to Harrison et al. (Harrison) in view of "JavaBeans v1.01" by Sun Microsystems, 1997 (JB v1.01).**

39. **Regarding Claim 3:** The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated; further, Harrison does not disclose the instantiated objects are JavaBeans. However, Harrison discloses the use of an object-oriented technology (col. 2, lines 34-35 'bundle of install objects').

The JB 1.01 teaches the instantiation of objects (pg. 98, ch. 10.4 'Instantiate a bean'), in an analogous art for the purpose of creating the bean (pg. 98, ch. 10.4 'The bean is created based on a name relative to a class-loader')

40. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to implement the installation methods disclosed in Harrison using JavaBeans as taught by the JB v1.01.

41. The modification would have been obvious because one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to provide a platform neutral product, such as that provided by the use of JavaBeans (JB v1.01 pg. 7 ch. 1.2 'One of the main goals of the JavaBeans architecture is to provide a platform neutral component architecture.')

**42. Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over USPN 6,051,032 to Harrison et al (Harrison) in view of USPN 6,233,565 B1 to Lewis et al. (Lewis).**

43. **Regarding Claim 7:** The rejection of claim 6 is incorporated; further, Harrison does not disclose the step of authenticating a server.

44. Lewis teaches authenticating a server (col. 29, lines 22-23 'the client and server have been authenticated to each other'), in an analogous art for the

purpose of establishing secure communications between the client and server (col. 29, lines 25-26).

45. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to secure the download disclosed in Harrison (col. 3, lines 56-58 'installed onto a node') with the techniques described in Lewis (col. 28, line 50-col. 29, line 19).

46. The modification would have been obvious because one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to provide a secure and reliable connection between client and server (Lewis col. 2, lines 6-8)

**47. Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over USPN 6,601,236 B1 to Curtis (Curtis) in view of USPN 6,233,565 B1 to Lewis et al. (Lewis).**

The applied reference has a common assignee with the instant application. Based upon the earlier effective U.S. filing date of the reference, it constitutes prior art only under 35 U.S.C. 102(e). This rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) might be overcome by: (1) a showing under 37 CFR 1.132 that any invention disclosed but not claimed in the reference was derived from the inventor of this application and is thus not an invention "by another"; (2) a showing of a date of invention for the claimed subject matter of the application which corresponds to subject matter disclosed but not claimed in the reference, prior to the effective U.S. filing date of the reference under 37 CFR 1.131; or (3) an oath or declaration under 37 CFR 1.130 stating that the application and

reference are currently owned by the same party and that the inventor named in the application is the prior inventor under 35 U.S.C. 104, together with a terminal disclaimer in accordance with 37 CFR 1.321(c). For applications filed on or after November 29, 1999, this rejection might also be overcome by showing that the subject matter of the reference and the claimed invention were, at the time the invention was made, owned by the same person or subject to an obligation of assignment to the same person. See MPEP § 706.02(l)(1) and § 706.02(l)(2).

48. **Regarding Claim 7:** The rejection of claim 6 is incorporated; further,

Curtis does not disclose the step of authenticating a server.

49. Lewis teaches authenticating a server (col. 29, lines 22-23 'the client and server have been authenticated to each other'), in an analogous art for the purpose of establishing secure communications (col. 29, lines 25-26).

50. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to secure the download disclosed in Curtis (col. 13, lines 1-4 'file sets are installed on the assigned destination drives') with the techniques described in Lewis (col. 28, line 50-col. 29, line 19).

51. The modification would have been obvious because one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to provide a secure and reliable connection between client and server (Lewis col. 2, lines 6-8)

52. **Claims 8, 13 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over USPN 6,601,236 B1 to Curtis (Curtis).**

The applied reference has a common assignee with the instant application. Based upon the earlier effective U.S. filing date of the reference, it constitutes prior art only under 35 U.S.C. 102(e). This rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) might be overcome by: (1) a showing under 37 CFR 1.132 that any invention disclosed but not claimed in the reference was derived from the inventor of this application and is thus not an invention "by another"; (2) a showing of a date of invention for the claimed subject matter of the application which corresponds to subject matter disclosed but not claimed in the reference, prior to the effective U.S. filing date of the reference under 37 CFR 1.131; or (3) an oath or declaration under 37 CFR 1.130 stating that the application and reference are currently owned by the same party and that the inventor named in the application is the prior inventor under 35 U.S.C. 104, together with a terminal disclaimer in accordance with 37 CFR 1.321(c). For applications filed on or after November 29, 1999, this rejection might also be overcome by showing that the subject matter of the reference and the claimed invention were, at the time the invention was made, owned by the same person or subject to an obligation of assignment to the same person. See MPEP § 706.02(l)(1) and § 706.02(l)(2).

**Regarding Claims 8, 13, and 18:** The rejections of claims 1, 10, and 15 are incorporated respectively; further, Curtis does not explicitly disclose that **each** topology object provides a recommended configuration. But does disclose offering the user a choice of topologies (col. 12, lines 1-12 'provide the user the opportunity to select the destination drives')

Curtis further teaches setting the properties of these drives prior to providing the choice to the user (col. 11, lines 20-26 'initializes itself setting fields').

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use the information gathered (col. 11, lines 20-26) to select a preferred drive to recommend to the user (col. 12, lines 1-12).

The modification would have been obvious because one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to minimize poor or impossible choices by the user (col. 12, lines 12-15 'if the user inadvertently selects a CD-ROM drive'), and maximize the chance of all install objects fitting on this installed drives (col. 12, lines 56-64 'if the available free storage space is insufficient, control returns to... user to input an alternate drive')

**Regarding Claims 9, 14, and 19:** The rejections of claims 1, 10, and 15 are incorporated respectively; further, Curtis does not explicitly disclose that **each** topology object provides a required configuration, but does disclose topology objects that provide required configurations for individual components (col. 12, lines 19-24 'can assign the desired destination drive').

Curtis further teaches setting the properties of these drives prior to providing the choice to the user (col. 11, lines 20-26 'initializes itself setting fields').

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use the information gathered (col. 11, lines 20-26) to select a suitable drive and require it's use in the installation (col. 12, lines 19-24).

The modification would have been obvious because one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to eliminate poor or impossible choices by the

user (col. 12, lines 12-15 'if the user inadvertently selects a CD-ROM drive'), and maximize the chance of all install objects fitting on this installed drives (col. 12, lines 56-64 'if the available free storage space is insufficient, control returns to... user to input an alternate drive')

### ***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jason Mitchell whose telephone number is (703)305-0064. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:30am - 4:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kakali Chaki can be reached on (703)305-9662. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Jason Mitchell  
08/24/04



ANIL KHATRI  
PRIMARY EXAMINER